DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 219 095 JC 820 004

AUTHOR Beachler, Judith Anne
TITLE The Community Education Project: Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania.
PUB DATE 12 Oct 81
NOTE 38p.; Paper presented and materials distributed at the Annual Conference of the National Council on Community Services and Continuing Education (Seattle, WA, October 11-14, 1981).

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Adult Education; Community Characteristics; Community Colleges; *Community Education; Community Involvement; Community Surveys; *Cooperative Programs; *Institutional Cooperation; Needs Assessment; Off Campus Facilities; *Outreach Programs; School Community Relationship; Social Agencies; Two Year Colleges; Urban Demography; *Urban Education
IDENTIFIERS *Community College of Allegheny County PA

ABSTRACT

This paper outlines aspects of a community education project, which involved the Community College of Allegheny County (CCAC) and other educational institutions and community service agencies in Pittsburgh in the provision of adult and continuing education and adult and family recreation programs. After section I provides background information on Pittsburgh and CCAC, section II reviews the initial planning phase of the project, which involved the creation of a planning committee and the establishment of its objectives, and describes the development of adult education programs at local facilities. Section III outlines the development, objectives, and results of a citywide community needs assessment survey. Sections IV and V discuss the composition of the governing commission for the community education project and describe the development of a funding proposal to the Mott Foundation. In section VI, the current status of the project, its possible extension, and problems of obtaining additional funds are discussed. The final section of the paper emphasizes problems and pitfalls in the development of the project including bureaucratic resistance, problems of "territory," the length of time to get the project off the ground, and specific local difficulties related to school desegregation and the closure of schools. Appended materials include a Community Education Committee report, the needs assessment instrument and data, and information on pilot programs. (HB)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED219095

THE COMMUNITY EDUCATION PROJECT

Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Judith A. Beachler

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC).

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

Presented by
Judith Anne Beachler
Director of Continuing and
Community Education
Community College of Allegheny
County, Allegheny Campus
Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania
October 12, 1981

JC820004

I. BACKGROUND INFORMATION

A. CITY OF PITTSBURGH

The city of Pittsburgh, composed of 74 neighborhoods, is the second largest metropolitan area of the state. Like many older urban centers of the Northeastern United States, it has experienced a steady decline in population over the past 25 years as well as a decline in the birth rate and the school age population:

CITY POPULATION

1950	1960	1970	1980
635,000	604,000	520,000	430,000

BIRTH RATE

1958	1978
20.1 (live births per thousand)	10.4 (live births per thousand)

SCHOOL POPULATION

1974-75	1979-80
65,063	48,795

In addition, the City's tax base has grown much slower than other areas of Allegheny County, although the county-wide growth has also declined:

ALLEGHENY COUNTY - GROWTH OF TAX BASE

	1965-70	1970-75	1975-80
City of Pittsburgh	8%	9%	3%
Burroughs of the County	24%	18%	18%
Townships of the County	32%	29%	26%

The declining birth rate, with the subsequent decline in school enrollment, and a population with growing numbers of older persons, plus a city whose tax base has grown at a slow rate, are all factors which set the stage for a coordinated approach to provision of community services. Pittsburgh has several available resources which enhance a cooperative effort: 3 Universities and 6 Colleges in the immediate area; a strong ethnic pride and identification with its neighborhoods; and a city government responsive to the needs of the city's neighborhoods. It also happens to be the third largest city which serves as the corporate headquarters, nationally.

B. COMMUNITY COLLEGE OF ALLEGHENY COUNTY

The Community College of Allegheny County is a 4-Campus System. Allegheny Campus is located within the City and assumes responsibility to develop programs that meet the educational needs of city residents; the other three campuses generally serve a suburban population. The thrust of the Allegheny Campus program as part of the Community Education Project is to offer a wide range of non-credit adult education courses and a minimal number of credit courses throughout the City.

CCAC, system-wide, enrolled approximately 60,300 part-time non-credit students annually in the 1979-80 Fiscal Year. Of that number, approximately 12,000-14,000 were enrolled in the Allegheny Campus' Evening Continuing Education program. Evening non-credit programs are offered at 23 sites located throughout the city which include public school districts facilities, parochial school facilities, county parks, racquet clubs, theatrical centers, senior citizen homes and nursing homes. Of the 23 centers, three are City Board of Education facilities around which the City of Pittsburgh's Community Education Project has been built.

The College is currently reimbursed by the State for non-credit Full Time Equivalencies.

II. INITIAL PLANNING PHASE

A. In the Spring of 1976, the Allegheny Campus Department of Continuing Education, the City of Pittsburgh Department of Parks and Recreation and the Perlow School of Music of the Irene Kaufmann Jewish Community Center were requested to augment an after school program which had been planned for a newly built Middle School that opened that year. The Reizenstein Middle School was built on the border of several neighborhoods located in the city's east wards with the intention of providing education to a racially, ethnically, socio-economically diverse population. Children in 9 neighborhoods attended the school. At the request of the Reizenstein Consortium Project Coordinator, the three above named institutions were requested to offer programs which would enhance the school's use by the larger community. It was believed that if residents of these 9 neighborhoods would have an opportunity to become involved in the use of the school through participation in the after school and evening programs, some of the tension felt by parents in the change of their children's schools would be eased and that the facility itself would be considered a community facility.

Community College offered a wide range of adult education courses and programs and a limited number of credit courses. The Perlow Music School offered a wide range of instructional music courses. The Department of Parks and Recreation offered free family and individual recreational programs and courses.

The following year, this project expanded to include programs in 4 more schools: one in the city's central neighborhood (it has since then been cancelled), one of its southwestern neighborhoods, one of its western neighborhoods, and in one of its southern neighborhoods (it has since then been cancelled).

This started the beginning of concern for a community education effort.

In the Summer and Fall of 1978, the agencies involved in this relationship began to become concerned about the subjects of duplication, role definition, increased cost in leasing school facilities and general institutional roles and goals. The first formal meeting of administrators of major institutions took place in March of 1979.

B. The 3 major service providers (Board of Education, CCAC and City of Pittsburgh) were joined in early 1980 by the Allegheny Conference on Community Development, a privately supported civic association to which many of the city's corporate executives lend their support for community improvement in the Pittsburgh metropolitan region, and several community representatives. At this same time the City of Pittsburgh's involvement expanded to include the Planning Department.

C. The Conference brought to the Planning Committee the skills of a student intern enrolled in a dual master degree program in the University of Pittsburgh's Graduate Schools of Social Work and Public and International Affairs. This individual brought a good deal of prior full-time experience in Community Education settings to the Planning group plus an unbiased approach to the concerns of "turf", institutional priorities, preconceived perceptions, and the like. Input was also given by a State University professor of Community Education. This was, in my estimation, the turning point towards progress for the committee.

Representatives of each agency met individually with this person, resulting in a status and recommendations report.

Discussion items of the report included:

A. Exploration of a working definition of Community Education
B. Concern for Agency Commitment
C. Setting of overall goals and objectives in relation with more specific institutional goals and objectives of participating agencies
D. Administrative Structure -- Board/Commission; Director
E. Preparation of a funding plan
F. Definition of roles and responsibilities of the participating agencies
G. Creation of a mechanism for community participation in the entire process
H. Concern for a Needs Assessment
I. Pilot Project Site Selection
J. Location Selection for Project
K. Utilization of University of Pittsburgh Internships

D. The formal process for funding started in late Spring 1980. In April, 1981, funding from the Charles S. Mott Foundation became a reality.

III. CITY-WIDE COMMUNITY NEEDS ASSESSMENT/MARKET STUDY

As early as the initial stages of planning (March 1979), a common concern was that of assessing community needs. Several formats were suggested. Should a needs assessment survey key in on specific communities? If so, should they be communities in which the programs currently exist? Or, should they be in communities which are not currently being served? Should an attempt be made to survey the entire city?

Research expertise was loaned to the committee by Xerox Corporation's Market Research Staff and from the University of Pittsburgh's Graduate Schools of Public and International Affairs and Social Work. The City of Pittsburgh through its Planning Department provided a small stipend of $2,600 to cover minimal costs. The Board of Education volunteered its public relations telephone bank to conduct the survey. A sub-committee of the Community Education Planning Committee was formed in the Spring of 1980 and served as a market research/needs assessment committee which designed and revised a telephone questionnaire three times, trained paid interviewers to conduct the survey, pre-tested the instrument twice, and made a final revisement.

The final survey was conducted, city-wide, over a three and one-half week period in late April/May, 1981 after word was received that the outside funding would be forthcoming. The city neighborhoods were clustered on the basis of socio-economic data.

(1) Issues related to crime and safety rank high among all socio-economic clusters, but rank dramatically higher among the poorest and the most affluent clusters than among those in the mid-range. Both in terms of issues which respondents feel are important for the community to address and where respondents would choose to put the largest share of public resources, crime/safety significantly outranked other issues.

(2) When asked about becoming involved at the community level in working on solutions to community problems, only 29% had ever been so involved. But of those who had not been involved, a significant 57% said they would consider being involved in the future. With the same question relating to educational and recreational opportunities, 46% and 27% respectively said they would consider involvement in the future. These data indicate a surprising degree of receptivity to various kinds of community involvement.

(3) Questions relating to what types of recreation the respondents would like to see improved or expanded generated a preference for increased opportunities for individual rather than team sports. The data needs further consideration in relation to the implications of CETA employment cut-backs in the City for night gym programs in the public schools.

(4) The responses indicated a greater interest in the expansion of educational programs in creative arts/crafts than in any other type of educational opportunity.

Of particular interest to the College was the fourth result. Plans have been made to analyze Fall 1981 non-credit enrollment patterns in relation to previous semesters to see if the creative arts and humanities are drawing higher levels of enrollment.

Indication of past participation in Community College adult education programs was prioritized as follows: vocational/technical course offerings, creative arts, physical education and humanities.

It should be noted that this information is preliminary. Additional analyses and the final report have not yet been completed.

IV. GOVERNING COMMISSION

In January 1981, a sub-committee of the overall project planning committee met to begin dealing with issues about the composition of the Project's governing commission.

The composition went through two major revisions with the final composition allowing for an overall majority representation from the five local institutions which contributed financially to the project. Membership on the commission is to remain open for additional member organizations as well as citizen representation. Additional member organizational representation will be based upon an institutions willingness to also commit a share of the local financial match.

Each of the five institutions was requested to provide the following representation to the commission: (1) an individual with direct programmatic responsibility to community education; (2) upper management representation for institutional policymaking commitment purposes and Board of Director/Trustee representation. The Community College is represented by (1) the Director of Continuing and Community Education, (2) the Allegheny Campus Executive Dean/Vice-President; and (3) a member of the College's Board of Trustees.

Local community representatives to the Commission were selected from the 4 areas in which the community education programs currently exist.

Both agency and community representatives were appointed for one year subject to change as determined by commission and/or founder committee members.

In addition, a Founders Committee was established and will meet at least once annually. Members of this Committee are the College's President, the School District's Superintendent, the Allegheny Conference's Executive Director, the HWPA Executive Director and the Mayor of the City. It was believed that this was necessary to keep an open flow of information about and commitment to the Project at the highest level of management of all 5 institutions.

The Commission was officially appointed in June 1981 and was steered for 3 months by a transition constituency of old project planning members who were also appointed to the new Commission. In addition, four on-going committees added new members to continue progress in the needs assessment study, rules and membership for the Commission, nomination of officers and the inventory of services and facilities. In September 1981, the transition committee disbanded, new officers were selected as was an executive committee of the Commission (one representative from each of the 3 institutions and one community-at-large representative who is also the Commission's Chairperson). The executive committee meets by-monthly to set the Commission's agenda; the Commission itself meets during the alternate months.

V. FUNDING PROPOSAL SUBMITTED TO THE CHARLES STEWART MOTT FOUNDATION

The funding proposal writing process officially began in the early Spring of 1980, and was sent to the Charles S. Mott Foundation in late May of 1980.

The Charles Stewart Mott Foundation was established in 1935 to sponsor a summer recreation project in Flint, Michigan; funding has since then grown to support the concept of community education. More than $300 million has been allocated over the years in support of community school programs which: (1) maximize school facility use (2) involve citizens in planning for extended school use (3) eliminate duplication of services and programs.

The 3 programmatic agencies and the Allegheny Conference on Community Development submitted equal shares of $7,500. Health and Welfare Planning Association was to serve as the administrative home for the project; HWPA's share was its "in-kind" contributions as the administrative home of the project, providing research and technical assistance. The total amount was to be matched by the Foundation in the amount of $42,500.

The proposal initially received a delay in its review, followed by revision requests. The final revision submitted in January of 1981, included changes in budget format and its narrative. The proposal was subsequently approved in late March, 1981 by the Board of Directors of the Mott Foundation. Approval of the proposal was for a one-year period with a commitment to consider the project for funding 4 to 5 years beyond the first year.

It should be added that concern was raised regarding the possibility of Mott's choosing not to fund the project, particularly due to the delay in time between the original submission to the actual approval. It was decided that all agencies would be requested to double their original match of $7,500. In anticipation of funding approval, interviewing of potential candidates for the position of project director took place; preliminary plans and revisions for a needs assessment study continued; the agencies involved outlined their individual institutional goals for year one; and plans for the selection of a commission were begun.

VI. THE PROJECT'S CURRENT STATUS - MAY 1, 1981 TO THE PRESENT (10/81)

Neighborhood Profiles are in the process of being developed by the new director. Inclusions in the profile are shown in the attached example. Approximately 8 neighborhood profiles have been completed. This information will prove extremely beneficial in program development.

A service provider data base is also being developed through contacts with neighborhood agencies. This information will give the Community Education Project a good role to serve as a referral organization.

The new director developed a training and/or planning guide for a neighborhood community education center. It is through the local community organizations that the director plans to begin recruiting for more effective citizen involvement. In addition, neighborhood school personnel i.e. principals, are being contacted by the director in an effort to gain this very necessary level of support for the concept.

During planning year one for the Mott funded project, it was decided that in addition to completing a city-wide needs assessment, one or more pilot projects would be attempted.

Five communities were considered on the basis of the needs assessment and through staff judgment. A tremendous amount of thought was given to exactly what the criteria for new pilot projects should be. Should one of the 3 currently served areas be selected and expanded programmatically by the inclusion of new agencies and providers?

Should new areas currently not being served at all be piloted? Should areas needing coordination of services rather than development of new services become the pilot project? Should an area such as the Herron Hill neighborhood in which programs have been previously attempted with little success become the pilot project?

It was decided by the Commission that 2 projects would be piloted during the Project's first year: 1) one in a new area which already is being serviced, but needing coordination, and 2) one in a new area that was underserved. At the September board meeting at which time we were seeking Commission approval of 2 pilot projects, a board member suggested an additional area as a pilot in which there exists one of the more successful of our three community schools; in addition, several other organizations are also providing services for this area of the City. This particular area was approved, as was the Central/East Northside neighborhood. The first was selected as an area needing coordination in programming, with the potential to give the project success upon which to build. The second area served as the pilot project for an underserved neighborhood.

In addition, a federal government proposal was developed and submitted by the new director with additional funds being requested for the pilot projects. The funding was not granted. The proposal received two very good reviews and one poor review but the common negative thread through all of them was the lack of citizen involvement from the beginning. Efforts are currently being discussed regarding expanded citizen involvement.

VII. CONCLUDING REMARKS

It has not been my intention to merely give you information on the successes of this new partnership for the Community College, as the community education literature is full of them. It seems quite inevitable when you reach a level of success, to ignore the fact that there are tremendous pitfalls along the way which hamper cooperative efforts. A look at the length of time spent thus far is an indication of this and the project is certainly not without any pitfalls at this point in time. In summing up, I would like to review several, both past and present.

It was the pitfalls which brought the 3 provider agencies together formally in 1979. Several issues had arisen: there was duplication of program offerings between the Department of Parks and Recreation and the Community College within the same center; there was concern over publicity and what neighborhoods were to be recruited for each center's programs, particularly since the Community College maintained other adult education centers in close proximity to Community Education Centers. There was an issue between the City Board of Education and the College over the new facility use lease. The College and Board hassled over a lease which added a considerable financial burden to the College. A lease was written which increased the cost of leasing classrooms to a level which was much higher than those which were being leased from other facility owners such as the parochial schools, libraries, churches, etc. In addition, this new lease was negotiated through letters, memos, and telephone calls without the parties involved ever formally meeting.

After its signing, the Community College removed one of it's adult education programs out of one of the five City Board of Education Centers and moved it into a parochial school located approximately 4-5 city blocks away within that same neighborhood.

The fact that the 3 organizations met at that particular time, I believe, was a vital turning point which brought us to the current status of the project. It is important to add here that it may never have happened if there had not been an individual without a direct affiliation through employment to any of the three institutions. This was the same individual who, through a grant-funded position was hired to deal with the original concerns of desegregation which started the program in 1976. This individual also had received support for the concept of Community Education from a member of the Board of Education who later became the Board Chairperson.

It's my belief that throughout this process there were tremendous "turf" problems which usually maintained themselves as "hidden agendas". It was not until they surfaced that there was an ability to deal with them. For example, there is tremendous pressure for the increase in enrollment in the College's Adult Education program due to the State's funding formula for community colleges. Questions such as what is adult education and what is recreation become very difficult to deal with. There has been a tendency in the past for difficulties to arise in terms of developing broad goals which serve all constituencies, while at the same time, maintaining the individual institutional goals as defined by each of the five organizations.

Along this same line is the tendency for large bureaucracies, due to their very nature, to resist change. Thus we have a tendency as professionals to become very standard in our approaches to problems, reacting in many cases as though they can be solved in only one way without consideration to alternatives.

The time frame problem itself is at times a tremendous detrement. Organizational participants in the process may tend to lose interest when accomplishments take so long. I myself have really ridden both the peaks and valleys of high and low enthusiasm and concern for the project, due to this situation. Progress is realized slowly due to the nature of the process.

The involvement of citizens on the committee has provided for some fascinating interaction. There has been a very natural tendency for each of these individuals to insist that his or her neighborhood is the one which should be considered as the pilot project area. There was great difficulty in making a selection which was accepted comfortably by all commission members.

Utilizing local neighborhood councils for the recruitment of citizen involvement seems a very practical logical and necessary route to take. But this is not without its own problem due to the political overtones of some of the councils. It can narrow rather than broaden the approach.

This Commission is extremely fortunate to have employed an individual who is well aware of the barriers to this process and is making positive efforts in bringing members closer together in working through some of the above mentioned barriers.

The current political mood of this country is also in favor of this approach. Many of us, frankly, have no choice due to severe federal funding cuts and diminishing local and state tax bases. On the local level, the Pittsburgh Board of Education has been plagued with the closing of 24 neighborhood schools which will have taken place between 1980 and 1986; the Board has been, and continues to be, forced to tackle two very large problems at one time: 1) Desegregation of the schools and 2) Closing of schools due to enrollment decline. It is hoped that the Community Education process will assist in removing some of the tensions of such political decisions. The College has much to gain through this involvement also. Preliminary census data indicates that the population of the city continues to grow older as the birth rate has dropped. The time appears to be ripe for adult education to continue its pattern of growth, provided programs are marketed appropriately to target populations.

APPENDIX

(Portions of the outline given to participants)

MEMO: February 4, 1980

TO: Community Education Committee

FROM: David M. Feehan

SUBJECT: Summary of Findings

INTRODUCTION:

Since early 1976, efforts have been underway to establish a community education program in Pittsburgh. In the spring of that year, representatives of the Reizenstein Consortium, Community College of Allegheny County, and the Department of Parks and Recreation met to initiate a community based community education program at Reizenstein. Since that time, community education programs have been started at three additional schools: Greenway, Milliones, and Brashear.

Slightly less than one year ago, additional agencies were asked to participate and a committee began meeting to explore possible expansion of the community education concept. The committee now includes representatives from Reizenstein Consortium, Community College of Allegheny County, the Board of Education, the Allegheny Conference on Community Development, the Office of the Mayor, the Department of City Planning, Community Action Pittsburg, Inc., the Department of Parks and Recreation and Partners in Education.

POSSIBLE DEFINITIONS:

The term Community Education is used to describe a process in which individual persons, community groups, organizations, and local, private, and governmental agencies cooperate to provide educational, recreational, vocational, cultural, social, and other related services to meet community needs through the use of educational and other facilities. (Undated memo, Pittsburgh Community Education Committee)

The Community Education concept operates on the premise that education is continuous rather than terminal, and that the school must accept a much broader sense of responsibility to all the people of the community; this is accomplished by rallying support of all citizens, providing continuing education and services, and seeking the cooperative solution to individual and community problems. (Jacksonville, Florida, Community Education Handbook)

A Community Education program is defined as a planned system to cooperatively deliver the many services - educational, recreational, social and cultural with the purpose of improving community life for all citizens. (Washington, D.C., Community Education Handbook)

Community Education offers a new role for public schools in which the schools and local citizens are active partners, providing learning and service opportunities through cooperation with other organizations, associations, agencies, and/or individuals. (Massachusetts Department of Education Policy Paper on Community Education)

U. S. OFFICE OF EDUCATION MINIMUM ELEMENTS FOR COMMUNITY EDUCATION:

1. School involvement - public school administration involved

2. Defined Community Served - program is community based

3. Public Facility Used - comprehensive program in public facility

4. Scope of Activities and Services - encompassing regular instruction and other services extended to all citizens

5. Community Needs - includes a continual systematic and effective procedure for identifying and documenting, as well as responding to the needs, interests and concerns of the community

6. Community Resources and Interagency Cooperation - identification and utilization of various resources through cooperative agreements

7. Program Clients - designed to serve all age groups; may focus on special, high-need populations

8. Community Participation - active and contiuous involvement of citizens in the assessment, planning, implementation, and evaluation of the total effort

CURRENT STATUS OF PITTSBURGH PROGRAM:

Several of the minimum elements cited above are now present in the current program offered by the participating agencies. The school administration is involved at the board level and at the state level. The Community College administration is also involved. Defined communities are being served, and public facilities are being used.

The scope of activities and services at the present time is limited to three primary areas: adult and continuing education, and family and adult recreation. An expanded community education program should examine gaps in the scope of activities and services of the current program, identify additional community needs and resources, and attempt to fill those gaps.

A procedure for systematically and effectively identifying, documenting, and responding to community needs should be created. At present, Community College uses a limited needs assessment procedure. Expansion and modification, perhaps with assistance from the business sector, is needed.

Interagency cooperation seems to be working well. A formal structure for administration of the program should also institutionalize this exciting interagency cooperation. This structure would also build in means of identifying a broad range of resources.

Current program clients represent only a small slice of the potential market; a high visibility marketing campaign must be developed to expand the awareness of potential participants, and to reach specially identified populations.

Community Participation is lacking in the current program. An expanded program may seek to involve existing neighborhood associations, a parent-teacher group, and other consumers and potential consumers in the needs assessment, planning, implementation, and evaluation of the program.

POSSIBLE GOALS FOR THE COMMUNITY EDUCATION COMMITTEE:

1. Develop a working definition of Community Education and consensus on the elements that are appropriate for Pittsburgh

2. Develop an administrative structure to operate the program which reflects the needs, concerns, and resources of the participating agencies and the communities to be served

3. Create a mechanism for community participation in the planning, needs assessment, and implementation process

4. Obtain the consent of all agencies represented to enter into a formal agreement resulting in a formal plan and proposal

5. Submit a proposal to appropriate funding sources for planning during the 1st half of 1981 and program implementation during the 2nd half of 1981

6. Investigated state appropriations to provide matching funds after initial funds are exhausted

The committee has reached a point where three major decisions must soon be made.

First, the committee must reach a consensus as to a working definition of community education, and what elements are to be contained in that definition;

Second, the committee must identify clear goals and objectives for the coming year, including selection of a site for an expansion or pilot project;

Third, the committee must operationalize these goals and objectives by deciding on an administrative structure, a funding plan, and the roles and responsibilities of each participating agency.

POSSIBLE RESOURCES:

Many of the resources for an expanded program will come from the participating agencies and newly identified agencies.

CITY-WIDE COMMUNITY NEEDS ASSESSMENT/MARKET STUDY

Draft for Pretest
9/17/80

PRELIMINARY INSTRUCTIONS:

Begin by reading the questionnaires over completely. Familiarize yourself with all the questions. Next, read the questions to yourself out load. Try to sound comfortable and natural. If a particular question doesn't work, or sounds stiff and unnatural, make a note of it. After you have been through the questionnaire alone, try interviewing a family member. Ask them to listen critically for (1) questions that don't work, or (2) parts of the questionnaire that don't seem to logically follow. Finally, call three random numbers and interview just as you would if this were the real thing. Complete each questionnaire and return to me.

NOTE: Some suggestions for telephone interviewing:

1. Pick a room where you won't be disturbed. Ask family members not to interrupt. Turn off TV, radio and other background noises.

2. Select an exchange you know is in the city (for example, 683-....). Select the last four numbers at random.

3. If you reach a non-residential address, or a non-cooperative person answers, politely terminate the interview.

4. Call between 6:30 P.M. and 9:30 P M.

COMMUNITY NEEDS SURVEY QUESTIONNAIRE

Interview # _____

Census Tract # _____

Cluster # _____

Neighborhood _____

Interviewer _____

Phone # called _____

Date called _____

Time interview begins _____

Time interview ends _____

Length of interview _____

Follow-up _____

Hello, my name is _____. Your telephone number was randomly selected for a study that we are conducting on community needs and how community services might meet these needs. The study is being conducted in cooperation with the City of Pittsburgh and several organizations within the City. (If the respondent asks for the names of the organizations, say "Allegheny Conference on Community Development, Community College of Allegheny County, and the Pittsburgh Board of Education are also participating in the study.")

First, I'd like to ask you a few simple questions and then I'd like to ask your thoughts and opinions about some community issues. If you're ready, let's get started. (If respondent is hesitant, restate that it is an important study being conducted so as to determine community needs. Also, mention the organizations which are cooperating in this effort)

1. Are you a resident of the City of Pittsburgh? (If no) Is there someone at this address who is a resident? May I speak with him or her? (If no) Thank you very much. Goodbye.
   (If yes, when that person answers)
   Are you a resident of the City of Pittsburgh? (If they are not sure, ask quaetion #3 and determine if they are or are not residents. Also, go back to introduction)

2. I'm going to read a list of categories, and I'd like you to tell me into which category your age falls:

1 _____	under 16	5 _____	35-44
2 _____	16-18	6 _____	45-54
3 _____	19-24	7 _____	55-64
4 _____	25-34	8 _____	65+

   (If the respondent is less than 16 years of age, ask to speak to any occupant of the residence who is 16 or older, go back to the introduction)

3. Could you give me the name of the community or neighborhood in which you live?
   _____ ___No Response

4. I'd like to know your opinion about some of the issues you feel are facing (give the name of the community the respondent mentioned in question # 3). These could either be serious community problems, or opportunities for something positive to happen in the community. What are some of the issues that come to your mind? _____
   _____
   _____ ___No Reponse

5. Next, let me ask you about some specific community activities. These are activities that either you or some member of your family might have participated in.
   To begin with, have you or any member of your family participated in a recreational activity at your local school, community center, or other community facility?

   (1)Yes_____ (2)No_____ (3)No answer_____

   (If No, go on to Question #10)

6. Where was this activity held?_____
   /__/ No Response/Not Applicable

7. Could you tell me specifically what kind of activity it was? (Ask if there was more than one activity, and if so, what they were). _____
   _____ /__/ No Response/Not Applicable

8. Are there any other kinds of recreational activities you'd like to see offered?
   (1)Yes_____ (2) No_____ (3) No answer_____
   (If No, go on to Question #10)

9. What kind of activity?_____
   /__/ No Response/Not Applicable
   (Go on to Question #12)

10. Are there any community recreational activities in which you would consider taking part?
    (1)Yes_____ (2)No_____ (3)No answer_____
    (If no, go on to Question #13)

11. What kind would you like to take part in?_____
    /__/ No Response/Not Applicable

12. What conditions would be necessary for you to participate?_____
    _____
    _____ /__/ No Response/Not Applicable

13. Have you or someone in your family joined with neighbors to work on a community problem or issue?
    (1)Yes_____ (2)No_____ (3) No answer_____
    (If No, go on to Question #16)

14. If this effort involved community meetings, could you tell me where they were held?_____ /__/ No Response/Not Applicable

15. Which problem or issue specifically did you try to change?_____
    _____
    _____ /__/ No Response/Not Applicable
    (Go to Question #19)

16. Would you consider joining with your neighbors to work on a community problem or issue?

(1)Yes_____ (2)No_____ (3)No answer_____

(If No, go on to Question #19)

17. What kinds of problems or issues would you be willing to join together with neighbors to solve?_____

_____ ☐ No Response

18. What conditions would be necessary for you to take part in such an effort?

_____

_____ ☐ No Response/Not Applicable

19. Have you or a member of your family taken an adult education course?

(1)Yes_____ (2)No_____ (3)No answer_____

(If No, go on to Question #22)

20. Do you remember where the class was held?_____

_____ ☐ No Response/Not Applicable

21. And could you tell me what kind of class it was?_____

_____ ☐ No Response/Not Applicable

(Go on to #23)

22. Would you be likely to participate in a course or workshop that interested you?

(1)Yes_____ (2)No_____ (3)No answer_____

(If No, go on to Question #25)

23. What (other) kinds of education opportunities would you like to see offered? (If the respondent says "something that interests me" - ask for specifics)

_____

_____ ☐ No Response/Not Applicable

24. What conditions would need to exist for you to take such a course?

_____

_____ ☐ No Response/Not Applicable

25. Neighborhood facilities, such as community centers, schools, and parks, often are important to a community. Could you tell me if there's such a facility near where you live?

(1)Yes_____ (2)No_____ (3)No answer_____

(If No, go on to Question #27)

26. For the following four questions, place the answers in the grid below: (If the respondent gives more than one answer per category, ask for the facility that is closer to them or that they use more often.)

A) Do you know what it's called?
B) Have you ever been there?
C) Approximately how many blocks is the (community center) (school) (park) from your home?
D) If you were going there, how would you get there (walk, care, bus, cab, other)?

	Exist	A Name	B Yes/No	C Distance	D Transportation
School	____	_____	__/__	_____	_____
Community Center	____	_____	__/__	_____	_____
Park	____	_____	__/__	_____	_____
_____	____	_____	__/__	_____	_____

27. I've mentioned a few ways, such as community meetings, classes, and recreational activities, that public facilities can be of benefit to a community. Can you think of any other ways public facilities, such as community centers and schools, could be used to benefit (name the community in which the respondent lives)?_____

_____

_____

_____ /__/ No Response

28. We've spoken about a number of concerns, issues, and programs which may appear in your community. Imagine for a moment that you have one thousand dollars which you can use in (name of the respondent's community). Imagine that you can spend the thousand on any one or all of five areas: health, recreation, crime, education and unemployment. If you had to spend it all, how would you divide it up? How many dollars would you spend in each area? Now, let me repeat the list: health, recreation, crime, education and unemployment.

Health $_____
Recreation $_____
Crime $_____
Education $_____
Unemployment $_____
No Response_____

(Make sure that the total adds up to $1,000)

The next few questions will allow me to place your questionnaire in the correct group:

29. Let's see, the first question is, are you male or female? (Pause for answer. If none given, say:) I'm assuming that you're (1)Male_____(2)Female_____ (3)Answer not available_____
That's correct, isn't it?

30. And your race is:

(1) White____
(2) Black____
(3) Hispanic____
(4) American Indian/Alaskan Native____
(5) Asian/Pacific Islander____

31. The highest level of education you've reached is:

(1) Less than high school____
(2) High school graduate/GED____
(3) Some college/trade school____
(4) College graduate____
(5) Post Graduate study____
(6) Answer not available____

32. Into which category should I place your household's income?

(1) $0-4,999 ____
(2) $5-9,999 ____
(3) $10-14,999 ____
(4) $15-19,999 ____
(5) $20-24,999 ____
(6) $25,000+ ____
(7) Refused ____
(8) Answer not available ____

33. Thank you very much for your time and cooperation. The information which you've been kind enough to give me is important to our study. Do you have any further comments or suggestions regarding any of the issues about which we've spoken?

_____
_____
_____
_____ ☐ No Response

Thank you. Have a good evening.

WEST END COMMUNITIES	HOUSING - DOMINANT TYPE	MEDIAN AGE - 1970	LARGEST AGE GROUPING - 1970	RACIAL COMPOSITION - 1970	OWNER OCCUPANCY RATE - 1970	EDUCATION % HIGH SCHOOL GRADUATE - 1970	MEDIAN FAMILY INCOME - 1970	DOMINANT OCCUPATION GROUPING
City		33.6	45-54	* B -20.2% * W -79.8%	47.2%		$8,800	
Ridgemont - Chicken Hill	Small, single family	26.7	25-34	B - 8.7% W -91-3%	42.3%	34.6%	$10,700	Sales - Clerical
East Carnegie		34.6	45-54	B - 5.2% W -94.8%	68.0%	30.3%	$10,018	Craftsmen - Foreman
Crafton Hts.- Westwood - Oakwood	Single family	31.1	45-54	B - .3% W -99.7%	74.7%	43.9%	$11,004	Sales - Clerical
Elliott	Single family	31.6	45-54	B - 4.3% W -95.7%	63.0%	32.0%	$8,826	Craftsmen-Foreman
West End Valley		44.5	55-64	B -32.2% W -67.8%	25.7%	8.6%	$7,071	Labor - Services
Sheraden/ Chartiers	Single family detached	29.9	45-54	B - 7.0% W -93.0%	72.6%	41.4%	$9,454	Craftsmen-Foreman
Esplen		32.5	45-54	B -10.8% W -89.2%	51.8%	28.7%	$7,828	Craftsmen-Foreman
Banksville	Single family, apts.	33.0	45-54	B - 0.0% W - 100.0%	89.6%	45.1%	$11,572	Sales - Clerical
Beechview		29.3	45-54	B - 1.9% W -98.1%	70.3%	41.1%	$9,666	Sales - Clerical

* B - Black
W - White

SCHOOLS											
Elementary	Middle	Secondary	Recreation Centers	Parks/ Parklets, Playgrounds	Gyms	Pools	Sr. Citizen Centers	Community Centers	Libraries	Private Agencies
Beechwood	Greenway	Brashear	Lee School (Rehab.)	Beechview Playground	Fairywood	Langley	West End Valley	Broadhead Comm. Ctr.	West End Valley	Urban League Day Care - Broadhead
Sheraden	Banksville	Langley	West End Rec. Center	Pauline Ave. Parklet	Chartiers	Greenway	Beechview	Salvation Army Ctr.- Broadhead	Beechview	Urban League Day Care - West End
Chartiers			Banksville Community Ctr.	Banksville Park	Sheraden	Brashear	Sheraden	West End-Elliott Multi-purpose Ctr.	Sheraden	
Stevens			Broadhead	Sheraden Park	Langley	Beechwood	West End Center			
Schaeffer				McGonnagle Playground	Greenway	Crane Ave.	Esplen			
Westwood				Wabash Playground	Brashear	Broadhead				
Fairywood				Herschel Playground	Stevens	Sheraden				
				Townsend Parklet	Schaeffer					
				West End Park	Westwood					
				Dunbar Playground						
				Oakwood Parklet						
				E. Carnegie Parklet						
				Able Long Playground						
				Alton Playground						
				Vannucci Field						
				Chartiers Playground						
				Stratmore Playground						
				Mutual Parklet						

NEEDS ASSESSMENT COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS
PILOT PROGRAM AREAS

(1) Upper North Side - an area which is very sparsely provided with recreational facilities or educational program centers. This sparse distribution will be even more diminished should Parks Department night gyms close. An additional factor in favor of the Upper North Side is the interest shown by the local community organization, including a letter formally requesting consideration as a pilot area. A pilot program here would be an effort to maximize the use of limited facilities through community planning and involvement.

(2) West End Communities - this area has few public recreational sites or meeting places. Population is widely dispersed in an area in which mobility and public transportation are limited. The existence of Greenway Community School centrally located in the area is an asset on which the program could build. The recent acquisition of the Lee School in Beechview by the City Department of Parks and Recreation would provide a second important locus for a Community Education program. Two community organizations in the Chartiers-Windgap and Esplen areas have indicated an interest to their communities.

(3) Homewood-Brushlon-Lemington area - the opening of the Homewood Center of Community College presents a base for the development of a Community Education program in the area incorporating community involvement in planning. Recreation facilities are limited in the area and would be further diminished by the closing of the night gyms.

(4) South Side - this area is well provided with facilities by the City Department of Parks and Recreation. It would be less heavily impacted than other communities by the closing of night gyms. It does not, however, have any access to educational programs such as those Community College can provide. Additionally, while programs and services for senior citizens are plentiful in the area, there is very little in the way of services for young and middle-aged adults. Facilities such as Ormsby Recreation Center, South High and the Henry Kaufmann Center-City gym complex provide excellent potential sites for a broad range of formal and informal educational programs. The South High OVT facilities, for example, have the potential for affording a variety of job-skill or retraining programs for adults.

(5) Hill District - from Herron Hill through Terrace Village, middle, Tower Hill and Bedford Dwellings - efforts to develop a community school at Milliones Middle School have not been successful, a fact which may be explained by the perceived inassessibility of the school, the cost of formal and informal courses, or the nature of courses offered. As a result the Milliones Community School is not currently functioning. A Hill District pilot program might provide the occasion to assess the failure of the Milliones program and develop a program which more accurately reflects the needs of the area. This might involve program revision, relocation or decentralization. Both Ammon Recreation Center and Wadsworth (to be reactivated) need to be considered as resources in any such reassessment.

POSSIBLE COMPONENTS OF COMMUNITY EDUCATION PILOT PROGRAMS

I. Community Involvement

A. Citizens Councils
- -surveys of need
- -inventory of programs, services
- -program development
- -interaction with providers
- -evaluation of program
- -interaction among groups/neighborhoods

B. Provider Councils
- -mechanism for consulting on
  - -shared facilities
  - -shared resources
  - -response to needs
- -means to improve communication, collaboration, information-sharing
- -cooperative resolution of issues or problems

II. Services and Programs (as needed)

A. Recreational Programs
- -age groups
- -special needs

B. Senior Citizen Services
- -baseline of Parks Dept. Centers with supplementary sites or services as needed

C. Day Care Services
- -Pre-school
- -latch key
- -adult day care

D. Educational Programs
- -formal-informal
- -credit-non-credit
- -short courses-full-term
- -skill development
- -job training (DOL Career Intern Program)

E. Health Department Services
- -health screening
- -WIC programs
- -dental clinics
- -"well-baby" clinics

F. Volunteer Citizen Training
- -leadership skills
- -supervision
- -needs assessment
- -decision-making
- -conflict management
- -volunteer assistance, e.g., tutoring, child care, assistance to the elderly, etc.

G. Information & Referral
- -telephone assistance
- -community directory of programs/ services

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA
ERIC® CLEARINGHOUSE FOR
JUNIOR COLLEGES
96 POWELL LIBRARY BUILDING
LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA 90024
EE 36

AUG 27 1982